



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Ἰὼριπ πο Θῆια ἀν ῥνα ἡάρουλι, ἀγυρ ῥιόδῶαν ἀπὶ ἀν ὅταλιν δεαῖτοιλ πο να βῶοιμιβ.

LUKE ii. 14.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. II.—No. 19.

JULY, 1853.

{ Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d.
Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Nunneries	73
Is the Protestant Bible a corrupt and mutilated translation of the Holy Scriptures?	73
The Passover and the Eucharist	74
On the Constrained Celibacy of the Clergy—Dialogue III.	75
The Catholic Doctrine on the Use of the Bible, by Cardinal Wiseman	76
The Marleys—A Story of Real Life	77
Talk of the Road—No. XIV.	78
The Discussion at Carthage	79
On the Internal Evidences of the Catholic Religion	80
CORRESPONDENCE—	
On the Visibility of the Church—by Philalethes	81
On Purgatory.—By Mr. E. Power	82
On a Sacrificing Priesthood—By D.	82
On the Sacrifice of the Mass.—By J. B.	83
On Christianity in India.—By Peregrinus	83
Farming Operations for July	83

NUNNERIES.

THE great increase in the number of nunneries in these countries, during the last few years, has brought the questions connected with those institutions more prominently before the public. In these countries, where employment in general for the male part of the population is abundant, and where emigration generally allures the unemployed away from our shores, the increase of monasteries is not likely to occur. Not so with regard to nunneries; for, as to them, the very same causes lead to their increase, and of this the Roman Catholic Church has eagerly availed itself.

During the middle ages, when violence was rife, and protection for female virtue from lawless force was often to be found only within the walls of the convent, reasons did exist for these institutions which certainly have no place at the present day. And now, undoubtedly, the only reasonable inquiry can be, whether religion, rightly understood, does, in any case, require persons to separate from the natural ties of relationship, renounce intercourse with the world, and enter into vows; to adopt a course of life which can, if necessary or desirable, be followed without them.

Now, we do not purpose to enter into the theological question, but we are anxious to call the attention of Roman Catholics to the evils necessarily arising out of such institutions, and to their obvious tendency to accumulate wealth in the hands of those who have the control or management of them; for, if they have such tendency, it surely is not unreasonable to infer that the motives of those who maintain their existence are, at least, open to grave suspicion, and are well calculated to excite the attention of those members of their own persuasion, who are not satisfied to encourage the grasping disposition of an ambitious priesthood. To enable such persons, therefore, to form a correct opinion on this subject, we will lay before our readers the facts of some cases which have, of late years, come before the public notice.

The first case to which we would refer is that of Fulham v. McCarthy; for, as the facts proved in it were made the foundation of a decree of the Court of Chancery, and were, consequently, the subject of protracted discussions, their accuracy can hardly be doubted, particularly, as the parties against whom the allegations were made, declined to go before a jury, to contest their truth. It appeared that two daughters of a wealthy Roman Catholic gentleman, at Cork, had entered as nuns into the Ursuline Convent there. With each of them, on their entrance, the father had given a portion of £1,000, on the understanding (as his son expressly stated before the Mortmain Committee) that they were not to participate further in his property. Some years afterwards, he died intestate, and his property, which amounted to about £90,000, became divisible amongst all his children, and the distributive share of each of the sisters, who had become nuns, would have amounted to nearly £10,000. It appeared that each of these sisters declared to several members of their own family, that they considered themselves as having no claim to any share, and their wish was to remove the legal claim, by an assignment to their brothers and sisters; indeed, one of them, in a conversation with her brothers, stated she had applied to the

superioress for permission to do so. To this application the superioress said that she had no power, but told her to apply to the bishop. The bishop, however, declared he had no power, and, when urged to say who had the power, he replied, "Nobody," and referred her back to the superioress.

The bishop's own statement as given in the cause confirms the fact of this application, for he admits that he told her that he had no power to grant her permission, or to dispense with her vows of poverty, and that she could not, consistently with such vow, alienate from the convent the property, and that, according to the rules and regulations of the institution, any property devolving upon her or upon any other professed nun, became the property of the community. The poor nun then said that the superioress had already referred her to him; upon which the bishop said—"You must observe your vow of obedience." The sisters, it would appear, notwithstanding these plain intimations of the will of their superiors, still resisted; but, at length, were coerced into signing the necessary deeds, assigning their property to the convent; and it was upon foot of these assignments that legal proceedings were instituted.

Of the means by which these assignments were obtained we have no obscure intimation in the evidence given in the cause. Mrs. Murrough, another of the sisters, and whose evidence the Chancellor stated to have been wholly unimpeached, says—"My sister Maria stated that she had signed a certain deed, in conformity with her vows of obedience. The other sister said she hoped the convent would never get a farthing of the money; and, previous to her signing the deed, she declared in the presence of the witness and of her brothers—that if she was obliged to sign a deed it would be like the act of a *dead person*, and that she would have no more power over her will or act than a dead person would have; that it was out of her power to avoid signing the deed, in consequence of the strictness of her vow, the operation of which she compared to the effect of the presentation of a pistol by a highwayman about to rob another."

This evidence of the sister confirms the evidence of the brother, who, in his examination, stated, that the same sister declared—"That she feared she would be obliged to sign the deed in compliance with her vows, and would be obliged to state that her acts were *free and voluntary*." After the deed was signed, the same sister said—"That she knew she did an act contrary to her conscience, but let the sin be on those who caused her to do so." The same witness said—"That having called the attention of her sister Maria to the statements of an affidavit made by her, and which were at variance with her sentiments as expressed to herself, she replied—"I refused to make that affidavit in my own person as coming from Maria McCarthy, but I told the solicitor if he put the word "religious" into the affidavit I would then take it. He then asked her this question—If one of the young ladies of the convent was obnoxious to the superioress, and you were desired to give her arsenic, would you do so under your vow of obedience. She said she would not be asked to do so. To which the witness very naturally replied—"Maria, do not say so—as they have asked you to make an affidavit which you refused to make in your own name, and to assist in proceedings taken contrary to your wish and without your consent." The same witness also stated that the other sister told him, "that if all the sufferings during her whole life were contracted within the space of half an hour, it would not equal what she suffered since her father's death in reference to this matter; and that she had seen a book in the convent, in which it was stated that the punishment for serious crime was to be immured, and fed on bread and water, and that, in some cases, persons had died of it; and that it had been decided that any member of the convent speaking or acting against their claims to this property would be guilty of mortal sin."

Now, this evidence was believed, and was the foundation on which the decree of the court rested; and, we would ask our readers, to consider well the workings of the system thus disclosed. It is obvious that, for one case thus brought before the public notice, fifty would occur of which no intimation would escape beyond the walls of the convent. The influence that the priesthood exercise over the members of their own flocks—the unwillingness to bring discredit on their spiritual superiors—the effect which the teaching of implicit obedience must produce in

the minds of the unhappy inmates, and the dread of incurring those penalties which, it appears, are denounced, even against the apparent hesitation to comply with the commands of their superiors, all combine to make it difficult, if not impossible, to bring such cases before our legal tribunals, or submit them to the ordeal of public opinion. But the very possibility that such things can occur, is surely sufficient to justify the Protestant objections to such institutions. And when Roman Catholics remember the class of persons from whom votaries are always sought—that it is invariably the wealthy and well-endowed who are urged to enter these communities—that the vows of poverty thus taken by the wealthy have a direct and manifest tendency to augment the general wealth of the great spiritual corporation to which they are attached—these things, surely, should excite their suspicions, and lead them to investigate narrowly the reasons on which such institutions are maintained.

To us, we confess, they appear wholly inconsistent with the spirit and tenor of the Gospel, which, in all its teachings, deals with mankind as social beings, bound to perform social duties, and in its precepts enjoins what our conduct should be in the various relations of life. It is in the daily duties of life—in our intercourse with our fellow man, that the best exercise of Christian feeling and Christian principles is to be found. And to reject the means thus appointed by Providence for our probation and trial appears to us to set at nought the ordinance of God, and to dethrone the God of nature from his throne, because, in his mercy he has also revealed himself as a God of grace.

IS THE PROTESTANT BIBLE A CORRUPT AND MUTILATED TRANSLATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES?

WE suspend our papers on the Douay Bible, for this month, for the purpose of giving insertion to the following valuable letter, which comes in very well into our series, as it applies to the notes of the present Douay Bible, the same examination which in our last number we applied to the text, and which thereby very much strengthens our argument.

Those who compare this letter with their Douay Bibles will probably observe that, in two or three places (such as Phil. ii. 7, and Hebrews i. 3), the Douay Bible, published at Derby, which the writer of this letter used, differs from the Douay Bibles now in use in Ireland. The notes which the writer gives from the Bible printed at Derby, are the same as those in the Irish Bibles. With very few exceptions these notes have been introduced into the Douay Bible in modern times. Very few of them were in the old Douay Bibles. We have not been able to trace back the new notes, farther than the Testament printed with Dr. Troy's sanction in 1803.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I trust that your Roman Catholic readers will duly appreciate your remarks under this title, and will profit by the service rendered to them by our translators of the sacred Scriptures.

You have satisfactorily shown that, if our version be the "Devil's Book," Romanists are much indebted to that book for the translation which they now possess.

In your examination you have shown the emendations made in successive Romish editions, up to the one now in circulation. If I am not anticipating the course of your arguments, I would beg to offer a few remarks on this last edition.

I have before me the edition published by Messrs. Richardson of Derby, with annotations by Dr. Challoner, which bears on the title page Dr. Wiseman's approval, dated from Birmingham, January, 1847, and "published with approbation."

The persons in authority, feeling how imperfect is the present Roman Catholic edition, and admiring the fullness and completeness of our authorised translation, in addition to the several emendations and corrections in the text embodied in the present Romish edition, as shown by your articles, have, in the notes, suggested still farther emendations and corrections. They have placed their corrections in foot-notes, and, doubtless, in a very short time, we shall

see these, also, incorporated in the text, when they are bold enough to publish another new edition.

The following are a few of the proposed emendations set out in the foot-notes of the Roman Catholic Bible now in use; and, to limit my remarks, I will take the New Testament alone.

It will be observed that, in most instances, the Romish version conveys no meaning, which is to be explained by the foot-notes which foot-note, actually borrow, in most instances, the exact words, and always the sense conveyed, by our authorized version.

In the following arrangement I place the Roman Catholic version first, then the foot-note, and, lastly, the Authorized version.

R. C. standing for the first, N. for the note to the Romish version, and P. for the Protestant or Authorized version.

R. C.—Matt. vi. 11—Give us this day our *supersubstantial bread*.

N.—In St. Luke the same word is rendered *daily bread*.

P.—Give us this day our *daily bread*.

R. C.—Matt. x. 16—Be ye, therefore, wise as serpents and simple as doves.

N.—That is, *harmless*, plain, &c.

P.—Be ye, therefore, wise as serpents, and *harmless* as doves.

R. C.—Matt. xi. 6—And blessed is he that shall not be scandalized in me.

N.—That is, who shall not take occasion of scandal or offence, &c.

P.—And blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me.

R. C.—Matt. xx. 15—Or is it not lawful for me to do what I will.

N.—Viz., *with my own*.

P.—Is it not lawful for me to do what I will *with mine own*?

R. C.—Matt. xxvi. 17—And on the first day of the *Assymes*: and, also, Mark xiv. 1, and Acts xii. 3.

N.—Feast of the *unleavened bread*.

P.—Now, the first day of the *feast of unleavened bread*.

R. C.—Luke xxiii. 54—And it was the day of the *parascève*, and the Sabbath drew near; and see John xix. 14.

N.—That is, the eve, or day of *preparation* for the Sabbath.

P.—And that day was the *preparation*, and the Sabbath drew near.

R. C.—John iii. 18—He that believeth in him is not *judged*.

N.—That is, is not *condemned*.

P.—He that believeth in him is not *condemned*.

R. C.—John iii. 19—And this is the judgment.

N.—That is, the cause of *condemnation*.

P.—And this is the *condemnation*.

R. C.—John xiv. 16—And he shall give you another *Paraclete*.

N.—That is, a *comforter*.

P.—He shall give you another *comforter*.

R. C.—Acts ii. 24—Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the *sorrows of hell*.

N.—Having overcome the grievous *pains of death*.

P.—Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the *pains of death*.

R. C.—Acts xvi. 16—A certain girl possessed with a *pythonical spirit*.

N.—That is, a spirit pretending to *divine* and tell fortunes.

P.—A certain damsel possessed with a spirit of *divination*.

R. C.—Romans vii. 1—As long as it liveth.

N.—As long as *he* liveth.

P.—As long as *he* liveth.

R. C.—Rom. viii. 38—For I am *sure*.

N.—That is, I am *persuaded*.

P.—For I am *persuaded*.

R. C.—1 Cor. ix. 16—For if I preach the Gospel it is no *glory*.

N.—That is, *I have nothing to glory of*.

P.—For though I preach the Gospel, *I have nothing to glory of*.

R. C.—1 Cor. x. 13—Let no temptation take hold on you but such as is *human*.

N.—Or, no temptation hath taken hold of you, or come upon you yet, but what is *human*, or incident to man.

P.—There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man.

R. C.—1 Cor. xiv. 12—So you also, for as much as you are *zealous of spirits*.

N.—Of *spiritual gifts*.

P.—Even so ye, forasmuch as ye are *zealous of spiritual gifts*.

R. C.—11 Cor. viii. 2—And their very deep poverty hath *abounded* unto the riches of their *simplicity*.

N.—That is, *sincere* bounty and charity.

P.—Unto the *riches of their liberality*.

R. C.—Gal. iii. 24—The Law was our *pedagogue*.

N.—i.e., *schoolmaster*.

P.—The Law was our *schoolmaster*.

R. C.—Eph. i. 14—For the redemption of *acquisition*.

N.—i.e., a *purchased possession*.

P.—Until the redemption of the *purchased possession*.

R. C.—Eph. iii. 15—Of whom *all paternity* in heaven and earth is named.

N.—Or *the whole family*.

P.—Of whom *the whole family*, &c.

R. C.—Phil. ii. 7—But debased himself.

N.—Made himself as of no account.

P.—But made himself of no reputation.

R. C.—2 Thess. ii. 3—For unless there came a *revolt*.

N.—A revolt or *falling off*.

P.—Except there come a *falling away*.

R. C.—2 Thess. iii. 1—That the Word of God *may run*.

N.—That is, *have free course*.

P.—That the Word of the Lord *may have free course*.

R. C.—2 Tim. i. 10—But now is made manifest by the illumination of our Saviour Jesus Christ.

N.—That is, by the bright coming and appearing of our Saviour.

P.—By the appearing, &c.

R. C.—Heb. i. 3—Who being the splendour of his glory and the *figure* of his substance.

N.—That is, the *express image*.

P.—And the *express image* of his person.

R. C.—Heb. ii. 16—For nowhere doth he *take hold* of the angels.

N.—That is, *he never took upon him the nature of angels*.

P.—He took not on him *the nature of angels*.

R. C.—Heb. vi. 1—Wherefore learning the Word of the beginning of Christ.

N.—The first rudiments of the Christian doctrine.

P.—Therefore, learning the principles of the doctrine of Christ.

R. C.—Heb. viii. 2—A Minister of the *Holies*.

N.—That is, the *sanctuary*.

P.—A Minister of the *sanctuary*.

R. C.—Heb. viii. 13—Now, in saying a new, *he* hath made the former old.

N.—A *new*, supply, *covenant*.

P.—A *new covenant* he hath made the first old.

R. C.—Heb. xi. 8—By faith, *he that is called Abraham*.

N.—He that is called Abraham, or Abraham *being called*.

P.—By faith, Abraham, *when he was called*.

R. C.—Heb. xi. 19—From whence also he received him for a *parable*.

N.—That is, as a *figure* of Christ.

P.—From whence also he received him in a *figure*.

R. C.—James i. 18—For of his own will hath he begotten us by the word of truth, that we might be *some beginning* of his creatures.

N.—Some *beginning*—that is, a kind of first fruits of his creatures.

P.—That we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures.

R. C.—2 Peter ii. 1. Who shall bring in sects of *perdition*.

N.—Sects of *perdition*—that is heresies destructive of salvation.

P.—Who privily shall bring in damnable heresies.

R. C.—2 Peter ii. 11—Whereas angels, though they are greater in strength and power, *bear not an execrable judgment* against them.

N.—That is, they use no railing, nor cursing sentence.

P.—Bear not railing accusation against them.

R. C.—1 John iii. 4—Whosoever committeth sin, committeth also *iniquity*.

N.—*Iniquity*, transgression of the law.

P.—Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth the law.

R. C.—3 John 4—I have no greater grace than this.

N.—That is, nothing that gives me greater joy.

P.—I have no greater joy, &c.

R. C.—Jude vi.—And the angels who kept not their *principality*.

N.—*Principality*; that is, the state in which they were first created.

P.—And the angels which kept not their first estate.

R. C.—Jude viii.—And blaspheme *majesty*.

N.—Speak evil of them that are in *dignity*.

P.—And speak evil of dignities.

R. C.—Jude ix.—The Lord *command thee*.

N.—Or *rebuke thee*.

P.—The Lord *rebuke thee*.

Such, then, are some of the proposed emendations borrowed from our Authorized version, the so-called "Devil's Book"!

Allow me to add one more remark.

Mr. Ward, in his "Errata," you inform us, "complains loudly of the heresy of the Protestant Bible, in translating the Greek word *ἐκκλησία*, *congregation* instead of *Church*," you might have added to your well directed arguments that the same word is rendered "society" in their own translation in Acts ii., 47. Roman Catholics can know a very little of their own Bible, otherwise they would not make such blunders, when they undertake to censure Protestants.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

C. H. COLLETTE.

THE PASSOVER AND THE EUCHARIST.

THE doctrine of the Eucharist forms such a prominent subject of controversy between the Churches of Rome and England, that, although it has been frequently discussed in our pages, yet we deem it needless to make any apology for bringing it again under the notice of our readers. The point which we are now about to discuss is one which is not generally adverted to, and Roman Catholic divines especially have, for the most part, omitted all mention of it. We hope, nevertheless, to show that it is not undeserving the careful consideration of all who value Scripture truth, and are anxious to learn all that the Bible makes known to us upon this important subject.

The Council of Trent, as most of our readers are aware, delivered the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, respecting the Eucharist, in eleven canons, which were passed in the thirteenth session of the Council. The first of these canons is as follows:—

"Whosoever shall deny that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there are truly, really, and substantially contained the body and the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with his soul and divinity, and, consequently, Christ entire; but shall affirm that he is present therein only in a sign or figure, let him be accursed."

Again, the third canon of the 22nd session of the same council, respecting the sacrifice of the mass, runs as follows:—

"If any one shall say that the mass is only a service of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice made on the cross, and not a true propitiatory offering; or that it only benefits him who receives it, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities, let him be accursed."

From these canons, it is abundantly clear that the Church of Rome holds that the wine in the Eucharist is changed into the *real, actual blood* of our Blessed Lord; and that, in the sacrament, this blood is offered up to God as a real propitiatory sacrifice, to make atonement for the sins of the living and the dead.

The Church of Rome declares further, in the second canon of the 22nd session of the same council, that our Lord, by the words—"Do this for a commemoration of me," appointed his apostles *priests*, to offer his body and blood. And we learn from the Acts of the Apostles that, shortly after our Lord's ascension, it was the custom of the Apostles, with the other converted Jews, to "break bread from house to house" daily—that is, to observe a daily celebration of this sacrament.

The question, then, naturally arises, did the Apostles and the Jewish converts really believe that the wine of which they partook in the Eucharist was really and actually the blood of our Blessed Lord? If they did, the controversy is, of course, settled; for, in a doctrine of such importance, all true Christians are bound to follow the inspired teachers whom Christ appointed to establish his Church in the world.

But did the apostles believe this? The Council of Trent must have supposed that they did; for if St. Peter and the other apostles believed that, in the Eucharist, they partook of wine and not of blood, the venerable Fathers who composed the council would scarcely have been so uncharitable as to utter a sweeping anathema against them. This is the point, however, on which we beg leave to entertain very serious doubts, and our reasons for doing so are as follows:—

One of the laws given by God to the Israelites in the wilderness, is contained in the following passage of Leviticus (Lev. xvii. 10, 11, 12, Douay version):—

"If any man whosever of the house of Israel, and of the strangers that sojourn among them, *eat blood*, I will set my face against his soul, and *will cut him off from among his people*. Because the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you, that you may make atonement with it upon the altar for your souls, and the blood may be for an expiation of the soul. Therefore, I have said to the children of Israel, no soul of you, nor of the strangers that sojourn among you, shall eat blood."

This injunction is given in such solemn words, and fenced in by such appalling sanctions, that it is scarcely possible to conceive a religious Israelite wilfully violating it. Not only were the whole people, Jews as well as Gentile proselytes, forbidden to eat blood, but the reason is expressly added by the Divine lawgiver—"Because it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." It was the very fact of the mysterious but necessary connection between the shedding of blood and the remission of sins, which is assigned as the reason for this law. All use of blood was forbidden, but more especially were the Jews prohibited from eating blood which was offered up upon